

Message

From: Montilla, Alex [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=B148B5335FF44AEA8970035668052F01-MONTILLA, ALEX]
Sent: 12/6/2019 6:17:00 PM
To: Andrew Stoeckle [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=user86405840]
CC: Emma X Jackman [Emma.Jackman@erg.com]; Brielle Kissel Meade [Brielle.Kissel@erg.com]; Matthew Heyward [Matthew.Heyward@erg.com]; Yourish, Jesse [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=e79088bd4f32479fab27f42aac124ccc-Yourish, Je]; Buckley, Timothy [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=197a3461d9824a17850f34cc2b0b37fe-Buckley, Timothy]; Scheitlin, Tom [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=user5f1cea1a]; Burden, David [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=9c217d84a6954468a3ead168926bde96-Burden, David]; Gillespie, Andrew [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=dce99ece87694a06b3009d7756e2a89e-Gillespie, Andrew]; Blancato, Jerry [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=232de363dad4cd9961900e10f56fddf-Blancato, Jerry]; Pruzinsky, Amanda [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=31594a2fac1e4d529b56148007541368-apruzins]; Barrette, Michael [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=237b7449b0084c8faea3a38d2bb31ea2-Mbarre04]
Subject: RE: Federal facilities and Places of Interest to-dos

Please see correction below.

Thanks,

Alex

From: Montilla, Alex
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2019 1:12 PM
To: Andrew Stoeckle <Andrew.Stoeckle@erg.com>
Cc: Emma X Jackman <Emma.Jackman@erg.com>; Brielle Kissel Meade <Brielle.Kissel@erg.com>; Matthew Heyward <Matthew.Heyward@erg.com>; Yourish, Jesse <yourish.jesse@epa.gov>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Scheitlin, Tom <Scheitlin.Tom@epa.gov>; Burden, David <Burden.David@epa.gov>; Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>; Blancato, Jerry <Blancato.Jerry@epa.gov>; Pruzinsky, Amanda <Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov>; Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Federal facilities and Places of Interest to-dos

Hi Andrew,

I think you've asked key process questions. My understanding of what comes next relative to Places of Interest is as follows:

- Programs/Regions provide inputs/updates to Places of Interest list and send them to PFASData@epa.gov NLT 13 December 2019 (unless this changes today)
- ORD/OSIM will collect all spreadsheets from Programs/Regions and place them in the Places of Interest folder within the PFASData@epa.gov inbox
- ORD/OSIM will provide ERG all relevant Places of Interest spreadsheets

- ERG will compile Places of Interest spreadsheets, curate the data, make necessary edits, and create a consolidated master list
 - OECA & ORD/CPHEA, ORD/CESER will provide ERG guidance on what to include or exclude from the final Places of Interest master list
 - OECA & ORD/CPHEA, ORD/CESER will provide responses to all NPL questions (see below)
 - ORD/OSIM will NOT inform which data to include or exclude from the master list
- ERG, OECA and ORD/CPHEA, ORD/CESER will perform QA of the consolidated master list
- Upon mutual concurrence of the quality of the master list, ERG will upload the final Places of Interest list into National PFAS Data Explorer
- EPA and ERG will work together to update language and context as necessary to reflect the correct messaging

If I've am mistaken or have left something out please let me know.

Thanks,

Alex

From: Andrew Stoeckle <Andrew.Stoeckle@erg.com>

Sent: Friday, December 06, 2019 12:17 PM

To: Pruzinsky, Amanda <Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov>; Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>; Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>

Cc: Emma X Jackman <Emma.Jackman@erg.com>; Brielle Kissel Meade <Brielle.Kissel@erg.com>; Matthew Heyward <Matthew.Heyward@erg.com>; Yourish, Jesse <yourish.jesse@epa.gov>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>

Subject: Federal facilities and Places of Interest to-dos

Looking ahead – Once the Places of Interest data calls are submitted, doe ERG understand the upcoming tasks? It may be that ERG is not doing some of these, but is the list of tasks below correct.

- We are expecting to see spreadsheets from NPL, RCRA-CR, and the PFAS Network (for non-NPL sites EPA is involved with).
- Review each submission to see if values are consistent within each data field
- Append the records in each file and review for duplicates
 - Amanda or ERG will revise federal facility list pre FFFRO comments
 - **Question:** Do NPL sites need to be removed from the Federal Facility list?
 - **Question:** While it has limited data, will the Federal Facility list be integrated into a single Places of Interest tab?
- Record data processing and QA steps (for repeating this effort and/or informing an OMS build)
- Load QA'd Places of Interest spreadsheet into Qlik and QA (EPA and ERG)
- Update Text displayed in tool (see below) and Fact Sheet, which is in Samantha Linkins' hands.
 - **Question:** What other text changes or documentation needed?

Places of Interest text placeholder

This visualization includes the locations of federal facilities (i.e. Department of Defense, Department of Energy, etc.) and private (non-federal facilities) National Priorities List (NPL) sites where PFAS has been detected at the site. NPL sites include those that are included on (F) and deleted from (D) the final NPL. The list of NPL sites with PFAS was compiled primarily from information gathered by EPA Regional personnel investigating sites and in some cases from information the respective state has collected. Investigation of NPL sites that may have PFAS contamination is an ongoing process, and the sites included here are at different stages of investigation and response. The search feature is provided, so that the user can gain more insight to what types facilities are in the area.

A detection at the site does **not** mean that levels are sufficient to pose a threat to human health risk or even that humans are exposed to the PFAS. For example, PFAS may have been detected in groundwater that no one is drinking. A detection does **not** necessarily mean there is a risk to the ecosystem. A detection does **not** identify the source of the PFAS. Detection also does **not** identify which specific PFAS are present at the site, or if, for example, PFOA or PFOS are at the site. There may be other PFAS at the site, not including PFOA or PFOS

Andrew Stoeckle | VP, Information and Analysis | Eastern Research Group | o. 781.674.7261 c. Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: Pruzinsky, Amanda <Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2019 5:00 PM

To: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>; Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Andrew Stoeckle <Andrew.Stoeckle@erg.com>

Subject: RE: PFAS Discrepancy file for DoD

Hi Mike,

I've reviewed the file and do not think this requires comments from NPL list (Linda) at this point. I created the crosswalk between the NPL and DoD's list, so I think it would be easiest if I make the changes myself. You could send it to her if you want her to confirm what DoD is suggesting. If you want to do that, I would prefer we do it before I make the things, so I don't have to do it twice.

There needs to be additional conversations with DoD about the facilities where their comment was "This isn't one of the 401 installations initially identified as having a known or suspected release of PFOS/PFOA" (i.e. most of the facilities highlighted in red). EPA is aware that they were not identified in the list that DoD emailed us, but they are in the DoD Report to HASC (attached) and it is one of the identified discrepancies that we are asking DoD to address.

Best,
Amanda

Amanda Pruzinsky
Physical Scientist
Water Branch NPDES Section
Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Division (ECAD)
U.S. EPA Region 3
1650 Arch St.
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-814-5456
Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov

From: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2019 11:39 AM

To: Pruzinsky, Amanda <Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov>; Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Andrew Stoeckle <Andrew.Stoeckle@erg.com>

Subject: FW: PFAS Discrepancy file for DoD

Hi Amanda,

I know you spent a bit of time on the original file. I was going to suggest, if you had time, that you perhaps add a column with your notes to the right, and then we send to Linda Gaines for her awareness comment. I assume that ERG can make the data updates to the Federal Agencies layer, but we need to decide whether we need to press DoD for more answers because it looks like they are disputing some of the rows that you found in the Report to Congress file. Let me know thoughts on proceeding. Thanks.

Mike

From: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2019 7:42 AM
To: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Pruzinsky, Amanda <Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov>; Hanselman, Erik <Hanselman.Erik@epa.gov>; Leff, Karin <Leff.Karin@epa.gov>; Long, Alexandria D CIV OSD OUSD A-S (USA) <Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)>; Morefield, Deborah A CIV OSD OUSD A-S (USA) <Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)>;
Routt, Christine [USA] <routt_christine@bah.com>
Subject: RE: PFAS Discrepancy file for DoD

Mike,

My apologies for not getting this information to you sooner. The attached spreadsheet should clarify the handful of facilities that you had questions.

Appreciate if you send us the web link and any press release so I can share it with the DoD Components.

VR,
deb

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

ODASD(Env)

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2019 5:59 PM
To: Morefield, Deborah A CIV OSD OUSD A-S (USA) <deborah.a.morefield.civ@mail.mil>
Cc: Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Pruzinsky, Amanda <Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov>; Hanselman, Erik <Hanselman.Erik@epa.gov>; Leff, Karin <Leff.Karin@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: PFAS Discrepancy file for DoD

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

I hope you are well. I wanted to let you know we are getting closer on our National PFAS Data Explorer release. Included in that release will be the file that you provided for our use, with a few minor corrections. I don't think we received any comments from you when we shared to proposed corrections in April.

The handful of facilities that are noted in red are ones that we found in the Report to Congress or that are on the NPL list that were not on the list you sent us. We plan to go with this QA'ed list unless you see anything that you think requires correction. If there are corrections needed, please let me know no later than December 3rd. Thanks.

Mike

From: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2019 8:44 AM
To: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Subject: FW: [Non-DoD Source] ECOS PFAS Caucus- Caucus & State Standards Calls, U.S. EPA Webinar on Analytic Tools

Michael,

Happy Wednesday. I know I am behind on providing you a review of our information for the PFAS Analytical Tool. It has been a little chaotic here.

I participate on the ECOS PFAS Caucus calls and during the last call it was mentioned EPA is hosting a webinar on the Tool. Is it possible for DoD to participate/listen to the webinar? I feel it may be helpful as we respond to your request for information.

Thanks,

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: Barrette, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 3:08 PM
To: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Cc: Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Pruzinsky, Amanda <Pruzinsky.Amanda@epa.gov>; Leff, Karin <Leff.Karin@epa.gov>; Dalzell, Sally <Dalzell.Sally@epa.gov>; Burchette, John <Burchette.John@epa.gov>; Baier-Anderson, Caroline <Baier-Anderson.Caroline@epa.gov>; Gaines, Linda <Gaines.Linda@epa.gov>; Freed, Elisabeth <Freed.Elisabeth@epa.gov>
Subject: PFAS Discrepancy file for DoD

Hi Deb,

Following our call a few weeks ago, I had promised to send you a file noting discrepancies between various lists of PFAS sites. Attached is the file. We discussed having a meeting in the next 3-4 weeks to discuss the PFAS Analytic Tools. I know you have sent the link to the various DoD components. So our next meeting would be to:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Perhaps you could forward this file along and propose some dates that we could meet. Also, we are happy to work on corrections prior to the meeting via email or phone. Amanda Pruzinsky is our technical contact on the lists. Thanks.

Mike

From: Pruzinsky, Amanda

Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 2:52 PM

To: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov <Caution-mailto:Barrette.Michael@epa.gov > >

Subject: RE: discrepancy file for DoD

Hi Mike,

Attached is the current file.

Background: DoD sent us files with their “known or suspected” sites with PFAS. This was a little over 400 sites and overall seems rather inclusive. I’ve compared the names of these sites to 3 other sources:

- 1) DoD’s report to Congress, which specifically identifies sites that had PFOA/PFOS detections above the LHA
Caution-<http://www.oea.gov/resource/addressing-perfluorooctane-sulfonate-pfos-and-perfluorooctanoic-acid-pfoa> <Caution-<http://www.oea.gov/resource/addressing-perfluorooctane-sulfonate-pfos-and-perfluorooctanoic-acid-pfoa> >
- 2) The NPL list of sites with PFAS detections
- 3) ATSDR’s website of PFAS sites Caution-https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/pfas/atsdr_sites_involvement.html <Caution-https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/pfas/atsdr_sites_involvement.html >

In the attached file “FF_check” sheet “Crosswalk” the orange and red names are ones I need help cross-walking. I’m trying to figure out if they are named differently in the DoD known/suspected file or just not in that file at all. Since the DoD known/suspected site list should be rather inclusive, I would think all of the sites on the other lists should be in that file and where they aren’t we are trying to determine why. The NPL locations are sometimes very site specific, so it could just be identifying the actual base. I provided a ReadMe sheet for help as well as the NPL and DoD overall files for help.

Basically, for the attached sheet “Crosswalk” why are sites listed in columns C-E (DoD report to congress sites, NPL sites, ATSDR sites), not in column B (DoD’s overall known/suspected list)?

Best,
Amanda